



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/732,023	12/08/2000	Paula S. Newman	001508-3230	1621

7590 02/17/2005

Gunnar G. Leinberg, Esq.  
NIXON PEABODY LLP.  
Clinton Square, P. O. Box 31051  
Rochester, NY 14603-1051

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THANH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2144

DATE MAILED: 02/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/732,023

Applicant(s)

NEWMAN, PAULA S.

Examiner

Tammy T Nguyen

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE (3) MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 December 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

## Detailed Office Action

1. This action is in response to amendment filed on October 5, 2004.
2. Claims 22-25 are newly added.
3. Claims ~~1-25~~ are pending.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

Art Unit: 2144

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sunil Paul., (hereinafter Paul) U.S. Patent No. 5,999,932 in view of Lewak et al., (hereinafter Lewak) U.S. Patent No. 5,544,360.
6. As to claim 1, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, including a method for displaying an e-mail collection comprising: receiving a sequence of e-mail messages (col.3, lines 60-65); categorizing each of the e-mail messages into at least one of a plurality of categories (col.3, lines 60-65, and col.4, lines 2-40). But Paul does not explicitly teach displaying each of the categorized messages in accordance with a display specification, wherein the display specification specifies one of a plurality of levels of the granularity for how the categorized messages in each of the plurality of categories are displayed. However, Lewak discloses displaying each of the categorized messages with specification that specifies one of plurality of levels of the granularity for how the categorized messages in each of plurality of categories are displayed (Hierarchy in fig.1 and categorize window 50 of fig.5 displayed) (files stored in a hierarchical, and displaying, selecting categorized files) (see col.6, lines 33-57, and col.16, lines 27-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Lewak into the computer system of Paul to have displaying each of the categorized messages

with specification that specifies one of plurality of levels of the granularity for how the categorized messages in each of plurality of categories are displayed because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions that easy for accessing to a large number of files and to files having overlapping categories.

7. As to claim 2, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising: receiving a plurality of display specifications from a user (col.9, lines 7-17); and receiving a user selection of one of the plurality of display specifications, wherein the displaying of the e-mail messages is in accordance with the user selected display specification (col.4, lines 5-40, col.8, line 20 to col.9, line 11).
8. As to claim 3, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, wherein provides for the display of the e-mail messages in one of the plurality of categories by encapsulating the messages into threads and for providing at least one item on the top level display for each of the corresponding threads (col.9, lines 7-15). But Paul does not explicitly teach plurality of levels of the granularity in the display specification. However, Lewak discloses plurality of levels of the granularity in the display specification (Hierarchy in fig.1) (see col.3, lines 45-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Lewak into the computer system of Paul to have plurality of levels of the granularity in the display specification because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions that easy for accessing to a large number of files and to files having overlapping categories.

9. As to claim 4, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, wherein provides for the display of the e-mail messages in one of the plurality of categories by encapsulating the messages in the corresponding category and for providing at least one item on the top level display for the corresponding category (col.8, line 20 to col.9, line 5). But Paul does not explicitly teach plurality of levels of the granularity in the display specification. However, Lewak discloses plurality of levels of the granularity in the display specification (Hierarchy in fig.1) (see col.3, lines 45-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Lewak into the computer system of Paul to have plurality of levels of the granularity in the display specification because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions that easy for accessing to a large number of files and to files having overlapping categories.
10. As to claim 5, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the display specification includes a plurality of user-defined rule-based categories, wherein one of the plurality of user-defined rule-based categories is nested within another of the plurality of user-defined rule-based categories and wherein the nested user-defined rule-based category is displayed differently than the another of the plurality of user-defined rule-based categories (col.4, lines 34-40).
11. As to claim 6, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising: providing an editor window display which lists the plurality of categories and a plurality of message display alternatives for each of the plurality of categories (col.5, lines 32-

- 38); and receiving a user selection of one of the plurality of message display alternatives for one of the plurality of categories (col.7, lines 29-41).
12. As to claim 7, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising: providing a tool button that is adapted to receive a user command to perform an operation on messages associated with an identified item (Fig.1A, e-mail filter 104, associated with message and identified item, and col.5, lines 18-25); and performing the operation on the messages associated with the identified item in response to a user operation of the tool button (col.5, lines 18-25)
13. As to claim 8, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, including a computer controlled display system for displaying an e-mail collection, the system comprising: a display for presenting the e-mail collection on a viewing area of the display (col.9, lines 7-15); and a processor that is adapted to receive a sequence of e-mail messages in the e-mail collection (Fig. 3A, inclusion list processor 302); to categorize each of the e-mail messages into at least one of a plurality of categories (col.3, lines 60-65, and col.7, lines 29-41). But Paul does not explicitly teach controlling the display to display the categorized messages in accordance with a display specification, wherein the display specification specifies one of a plurality of levels of the granularity for how the categorized messages in each of the plurality of categories are displayed. However, Lewak discloses displaying each of the categorized messages with specification that specifies one of plurality of levels of the granularity for how the categorized messages in each of plurality of categories are displayed (Hierarchy in fig.1 and categorize window 50 of fig.5 displayed) (files stored in a hierarchical, and

displaying, selecting categorized files) (see col.6, lines 33-57, and col.16, lines 27-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Lewak into the computer system of Paul to have displaying each of the categorized messages with specification that specifies one of plurality of levels of the granularity for how the categorized messages in each of plurality of categories are displayed because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions that easy for accessing to a large number of files and to files having overlapping categories.

14. As to claim 9, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the processor is further adapted to: receive a plurality of display specifications from the user; and receive a user selection of one of the plurality of display specifications, wherein the display of e-mail messages is in accordance with the user selected display specification (col.4, lines 5-40, col.8, line 20 to col.9, line 11).
15. As to claim 10, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, wherein provides for the display of the e-mail messages in one of the plurality of categories by encapsulating the messages into threads and for providing one item on the top level display for each of the corresponding threads (col.9, lines 7-15). But Paul does not explicitly teach plurality of levels of the granularity in the display specification. However, Lewak discloses plurality of levels of the granularity in the display specification (Hierarchy in fig.1) (see col.3, lines 45-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Lewak into the computer system of Paul to have plurality of levels of the granularity in the



display specification because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions that easy for accessing to a large number of files and to files having overlapping categories.

16. As to claim 11, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, wherein provides for the display of the e-mail messages in one of the plurality of categories by encapsulating the messages in the corresponding category and for providing at least one item on the top level display for the corresponding category (col.8, line 20 to col.9, line 5). But Paul does not explicitly teach plurality of levels of the granularity in the display specification. However, Lewak discloses plurality of levels of the granularity in the display specification (Hierarchy in fig.1) (see col.3, lines 45-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Lewak into the computer system of Paul to have plurality of levels of the granularity in the display specification because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions that easy for accessing to a large number of files and to files having overlapping categories.
17. As to claim 12, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the display specification includes a plurality of user-defined rule-based definitions of categories, wherein at least one of the plurality of user defined rule-based categories is nested within another of the plurality of user-defined rule-based categories, and wherein the nested user-defined rule-based category is displayed differently than the another of the plurality of user-defined rule-based categories col.4, lines 34-40).

18. As to claim 13, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the processor is further adapted: to provide an editor window display which lists the plurality of categories and a plurality of message display alternatives for each of the plurality of categories (col.5, lines 32-38); to receive a user selection of one of the plurality of message display alternatives for one of the plurality of categories (col.7, lines 29-41).
19. As to claim 14, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the processor is further adapted: to provide a tool button that is adapted to receive a user command to delete messages associated with an identified item (Fig.1A, e-mail filter 104, associated with message and identified item, and col.5, lines 18-25); and to delete the messages associated with the identified item in response to a user operation of the tool button col.5, lines 18-25).
20. As to claim 15, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the processor is further adapted: to receive a user command from a tool button (Fig.1A, e-mail filter 104, associated with message and identified item); and to perform the operation on the messages associated with the identified item in response to a user operation of the tool button (Fig.1A)
21. As to claim 16, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, including an information storage media comprising information that displays an e-mail collection, the information comprising: information that receives a sequence of e-mail messages in the e-mail collection (col.3, lines 60-65); information that categorizes each of the e-mail messages into at least one of a plurality of categories (col.3, lines 60-65, and col.4, lines 2-40); But Paul does not explicitly teach information that displays each of

the categorized messages in accordance with a display specification, wherein the display specification specifies one of a plurality of levels of the granularity for how the categorized messages in each of the plurality of categories are displayed.

However, Lewak discloses displaying each of the categorized messages with specification that specifies one of plurality of levels of the granularity for how the categorized messages in each of plurality of categories are displayed (Hierarchy in fig.1 and categorize window 50 of fig.5 displayed) (files stored in a hierarchical, and displaying, selecting categorized files) (see col.6, lines 33-57, and col.16, lines 27-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Lewak into the computer system of Paul to have displaying each of the categorized messages with specification that specifies one of plurality of levels of the granularity for how the categorized messages in each of plurality of categories are displayed because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions that easy for accessing to a large number of files and to files having overlapping categories.

22. As to claim 17, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising:  
information that receives a plurality of display specifications from a user (col.9, lines 7-17); and information that receives a user selection of one of the plurality of display specifications, wherein the displaying of the e-mail messages is in accordance with the user selected display specification (col.4, lines 5-40, col.8, line 20 to col.9, line 11).

23. As to claim 18, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, wherein provides for the display of the e-mail messages in one of the plurality of categories by encapsulating the messages into threads and for providing at least one item on a top level display for each of the corresponding threads (col.9, lines 7-15). But Paul does not explicitly teach plurality of levels of the granularity in the display specification. However, Lewak discloses plurality of levels of the granularity in the display specification (Hierarchy in fig.1) (see col.3, lines 45-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Lewak into the computer system of Paul to have plurality of levels of the granularity in the display specification because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions that easy for accessing to a large number of files and to files having overlapping categories.
24. As to claim 19, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, wherein provides for the display of the e-mail messages in one of the plurality of categories by encapsulating the messages in the corresponding category and for providing one item on the top level display for the corresponding category (col.8, line 20 to col.9, line 5). But Paul does not explicitly teach plurality of levels of the granularity in the display specification. However, Lewak discloses plurality of levels of the granularity in the display specification (Hierarchy in fig.1) (see col.3, lines 45-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Lewak into the computer system of Paul to have plurality of levels of the granularity in the display specification because it would have an

efficient system that can provide specific functions that easy for accessing to a large number of files and to files having overlapping categories.

25. As to claim 20, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the display specification includes a plurality of user-defined rule-based categories, wherein at least one of the plurality of user-defined rule based categories is nested within another of the plurality of user-defined rule-based categories, and wherein the nested user-defined rule-based category is displayed differently than the another of the plurality of user-defined rule-based categories (col.4, lines 34-40).
26. As to claim 21, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising: information that provides an editor window display which lists the plurality of categories and a plurality of message display alternatives for each of the plurality of categories (col.5, lines 32-38); and information that receives a user selection of one of the plurality of message display alternatives for one of the plurality of categories (col.7, lines 29-41).
27. As to claim 22, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising information that: receives a user command (Fig.1A, e-mail filter 104, associated with message and identified item); and performs the operation on the messages associated with the identified item in response to a user operation of the tool button. (Fig.1A).
28. As to claims 23,24, and 25, Paul teaches the invention as claimed, wherein plurality of levels of granularity provide for the display of the e-mail messages as at least two of: messages; threads; and groups (fig.3) (see col.7, lines 50-62).

***Conclusion***

29. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

30. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Tammy T. Nguyen** who may be reached via telephone at **(571) 272-3929**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. eastern standard time.

If you need to send the Examiner, a facsimile transmission regarding this instant application, please send it to **(703) 872-9306**. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Bill Cuchlinski, may be reached at **(571) 272-3925**.

*TTN*

February 11, 2005

  
WILLIAM A. CUCHLINSKI, JR.  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2000